

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

GABRIEL NAVARRO, Individually and on  
Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 2:22-cv-01552-RSL

REALPAGE, INC.; GREYSTAR REAL  
ESTATE PARTNERS, LLC; CUSHMAN &  
WAKEFIELD, INC.; PINNACLE PROPERTY  
MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LLC; BH  
MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LLC; CAMPUS  
ADVANTAGE, INC.; CARDINAL GROUP  
HOLDINGS LLC; CA VENTURES GLOBAL  
SERVICES, LLC; D.P. PREISS COMPANY,  
INC.; THE MICHAELS ORGANIZATION,  
LLC and INTERSTATE REALTY  
MANAGEMENT COMPANY,

Defendants.

STATUS REPORT

Plaintiffs and Defendants in the above-captioned action respectfully submit this status report pursuant to the Court's orders of November 28, 2022 and December 1, 2022, which directed the parties to meet and confer and file a status report regarding a proposed case schedule. *See Navarro v. RealPage, Inc., et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01552-RSL (W.D. Wash.), ECF Nos. 21, 41. Pursuant to the Court's order, Plaintiffs and Defendants met and conferred regarding a proposed case schedule on December 19, 2022. They have stated their respective positions on the subject below.

**Plaintiffs' Position.** The Parties had previously filed stipulated motions in *Alvarez* and

1 *Navarro* requesting that the Court suspend Defendants’ deadlines to respond to the complaint,  
2 in light of the fact that several actions had been filed and continued to be filed in courts around  
3 the country, and instead file a status report on December 21, 2022. . *See Navarro* Dkt. 21, 41;  
4 *Alvarez* Dkt. 11. In *Cherry*, this Court ordered the parties to file a status report by December  
5 21, 2022 after the case was transferred. *Cherry* Dkt. 41.

6 Since then, several critical developments have transpired readying the case for a  
7 schedule, as explained below.

8 First, this case is one of many involving Defendant RealPage, Inc. and several other  
9 overlapping defendants that was related to *Navarro, et al. v. RealPage, Inc., et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-  
10 01552-RSL, and re-assigned to this Court. At this point, 11 cases involving RealPage in the  
11 Western District of Washington are now pending before this Court.

12 Second, on December 8 and 9, 2022, Defendants filed a motion before the Judicial  
13 Panel on Multi-District Litigation (“JPML”) seeking to have various litigation matters,  
14 including those pending before this Court, transferred to the Northern District of Texas. *See*  
15 *e.g., Alvarez* Dkt. 31. Defendants filed that motion after counsel for the plaintiffs in these  
16 various actions had begun coordinating to dismiss and re-file their matters in this Court,  
17 consistent with the JPML’s instruction that plaintiffs must explore alternatives to centralization,  
18 such as seeking to privately agree on a consensus jurisdiction, prior to burdening the JPML  
19 with a centralization motion under Section 1407.<sup>1</sup> On December 16, 2022, the JPML *sua*  
20 *sponte* dismissed Defendants’ motion to transfer venue as moot because plaintiffs’ successful  
21 coordination deprived the matter of its multi-jurisdictional character. *See Alvarez* Dkt. 46.

22 Third, on December 19, 2022, the plaintiffs in all cases pending at that point in time  
23 before the Western District of Washington filed a motion to consolidate these cases and appoint  
24

---

25 <sup>1</sup> *In re: Gerber Probiotic Prod. Mktg. & Sales Pracs. Litig.*, 899 F. Supp. 2d 1378, 1379–80 (U.S. Jud. Pan. Mult.  
26 Lit. 2012) (“The Panel has often stated that centralization under Section 1407 ‘should be the last solution after  
27 considered review of all other options.’ *In re Best Buy Co., Inc., California Song–Beverly Credit Card Act Litig.*,  
804 F.Supp.2d 1376, 1378 (J.P.M.L.2011). These options include: Section 1404 transfer; dismissal or stay under  
the first-to-file doctrine; agreement by plaintiffs to voluntarily dismiss their actions in favor of one district; and  
cooperation and coordination among the parties and the various transferor courts.”).

1 interim co-lead class counsel and a plaintiffs' executive committee to promote efficient  
2 coordination of these related litigation matters. *See Navarro* Dkt. 67.

3 These developments make clear that all related cases in The Western District of  
4 Washington either have been, or are soon expected to be, coordinated before this Court.<sup>2</sup>

5 Defendants' main stated reason for continuing to delay is the existence of certain,  
6 copycat actions filed within the last week by a single group of law firms on behalf of subsets of  
7 the proposed nationwide multifamily class of renters. *See Weaver v. RealPage, Inc., et al.*, No.  
8 1:22-cv-3224 (D. Col.) (proposed class of multifamily renters in the Denver area); *White v.*  
9 *RealPage, Inc., et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-12134 (D. Mass.) (proposed class of multifamily renters in  
10 the Boston area); *Vincin et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-01329 (W.D. Tex.)  
11 (proposed class of multifamily renters in the Austin area); (*Carter v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No.  
12 1:22-cv-1332 (W.D. Tex.) (proposed class of multifamily renters in the Austin area; and  
13 *Boelens v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01802 (W.D. Wash.) (proposed class of  
14 multifamily renters in the Seattle area).

15 Plaintiffs are reaching out to the plaintiffs in those actions to see if they will consent to  
16 transfer and consolidation of those cases before this Court. In any case, the existence of these  
17 copycat cases —filed months after the actions here—is no reason to halt progress in the  
18 pending cases already before this Court.

19 In particular, in the event that the Court grants Plaintiffs' pending, unopposed  
20 leadership motions, Plaintiff counsel will represent, respectively, putative nationwide classes of  
21 multifamily and student renters and will have the full ability to efficiently coordinate all  
22 litigation nationwide pending on behalf of the classes. Appointment of leadership would  
23 confirm that Plaintiff counsel is interim class counsel on behalf of nationwide classes, including  
24 subsets of that class for which copycat actions are currently pending outside this district.  
25 Plaintiffs anticipate that prompt appointment of leadership in these cases would be efficient  
26

---

27 <sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs in the recently filed *Boelens* case noted on their civil cover sheet that the case was related to the eleven  
cases pending before this Court. *See Boelens v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01802 (W.D. Wash.), Dkt. 1.

1 because it may obviate any need for an MDL in the event that Defendants renew those efforts.  
2 Therefore, the Court's ruling on the pending, unopposed leadership motions would be greatly  
3 beneficial in aiding Plaintiffs' continued efforts to coordinate all related cases.

4 Defendants also provide no explanation for why the Court should delay in resolving  
5 Plaintiffs' motion to consolidate nor do they voice any substantive objection to consolidation.  
6 Indeed, Defendants themselves repeatedly emphasize the need for efficiency and do not dispute  
7 that the cases are related. There is no reason to delay on consolidating the cases that are  
8 currently before this court.

9 Therefore, Plaintiffs think that these cases are now ready to proceed. Plaintiffs  
10 respectfully submit that the Court should grant the pending consolidation motion and adopt the  
11 following schedule:

- 12 • **45 Days After Order Granting Consolidation:** Plaintiffs to file Consolidated  
13 Class Action Complaint.
- 14 • **45 Days After Consolidated Complaint or Order Denying Consolidation:**  
15 Defendants to file consolidated motion to dismiss not to exceed 30 pages.<sup>3</sup> Each  
16 Defendant may have the option to file a separate, additional statement not exceeding  
17 4 pages addressing unique issues that cannot be and are not covered in a joint brief.
- 18 • **45 Days After Motion to Dismiss:** Plaintiffs to file a consolidated opposition not  
19 to exceed 30 pages, with up to 4 pages to respond to each separate statement by a  
20 Defendant (which may be filed separately or in a consolidated fashion).
- 21 • **21 Days After Opposition to Motion to Dismiss:** Defendants to file a  
22 consolidated reply brief not to exceed 15 pages. To the extent any Defendant filed a  
23 separate opposition addressing Defendant-specific concerns, they shall have up to 2  
24 additional pages to file a reply to any Defendant-specific opposition filed by  
25 Plaintiffs.
- 26 • **Hearing on Motion to Dismiss:** To be scheduled at the Court's convenience.

27 <sup>3</sup> Plaintiffs are willing to meet and confer further with Defendants regarding page limits.

**Defendants' Position.** Defendants respectfully submit that it would be premature to enter a case schedule at this time. The above-captioned action is related to at least 15 other actions, including four actions respectively pending in the Western District of Texas, the District of Colorado, and the District of Massachusetts.<sup>4</sup> Defendants believe that judicial and party efficiency is best served by first determining the District in which all 16 of these actions (collectively, the "Related Actions") will be consolidated and heard for common pre-trial proceedings before imposing a litigation schedule, or ordering any other activity, in this matter. Defendants and other defendants named in the Related Actions will soon be filing a motion to transfer Related Actions, including the above-captioned action, to a District outside Washington. A group of defendants named in the Related Actions, including many Defendants, previously filed a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 before the U.S. Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (the "Panel") to consolidate the Related Actions in the Northern District of Texas, which the Panel dismissed as moot, on December 16, 2022, because all extant cases at the time of dismissal were in the Western District of Washington.<sup>5</sup> In the intervening five days, however, four Related Actions have been filed outside the Western District of Washington. Moreover, because the most recently filed cases were filed by different Plaintiffs' counsel, there is no indication that those cases will be dismissed and re-filed here. The Related Actions accordingly span multiple districts

---

<sup>4</sup> These fifteen other related actions are: (1) *Alvarez et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01617-RSL (W.D. Wash.); (2) *Cherry et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01618 (W.D. Wash.); (3) *Morgan et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01712 (W.D. Wash.); (4) *Armas et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01726 (W.D. Wash.); (5) *Johnson v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01734 (W.D. Wash.); (6) *Silverman et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01740 (W.D. Wash.); (7) *Bohn et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01743 (W.D. Wash.); (8) *Pham et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01744 (W.D. Wash.); (9) *Weaver v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-03224 (D. Colo.); (10) *Godfrey v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01759 (W.D. Wash.); (11) *Zhovmiruk v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01779 (W.D. Wash.); (12) *White v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-12134 (D. Mass.); (13) *Vincin et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-01329 (W.D. Tex.); (14) *Carter v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 1:22-cv-1332 (W.D. Tex.); and (15) *Boelens v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-01802 (W.D. Wash.).

<sup>5</sup> At the time Defendants filed their original § 1407 motion, multiple actions were pending outside the Western District of Washington, but, after the motion was filed, Plaintiffs dismissed those actions and re-filed several here, likely in an attempt to moot the motion.

1 and a transfer of Related Actions to one District is necessary so that they may proceed efficiently.

2 For similar reasons, the Court should not take up Plaintiffs' invitation to consider their  
3 motions for consolidation and to appoint lead counsel unless and until disputes over the proper  
4 venue for the Related Actions are resolved in favor of the Western District of Washington. As  
5 an initial matter, Plaintiffs' characterization of their leadership motion as "unopposed" is  
6 premature. Further, even if the Court were to grant Plaintiffs' leadership motion, Defendants  
7 disagree that such a ruling could bind plaintiffs in other Districts. In fact, not even all of the  
8 Related Actions in the Western District of Washington are subject to Plaintiffs' consolidation  
9 and leadership motions. In any event, Plaintiffs no doubt prefer this forum considering that they  
10 first filed lawsuits in other states before dismissing them only to re-file here, but where, as here,  
11 cases exist in multiple Districts, judicial and party efficiency necessitates resolving the proper  
12 venue for all Related Actions before proceeding in only a subset of them. Moreover, in one of  
13 the other Related Actions currently before this Court, Defendant Equity Residential filed a  
14 Motion to Transfer Case to the Southern District of California based on authorities that have  
15 rejected the type of maneuvering in which the plaintiffs in that Related Action have engaged.  
16 *See Morgan et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:22-cv-017120-RSL (W.D. Wash.), ECF No. 20.  
17 Defendants believe that a resolution of Equity Residential's motion will be relevant to the  
18 determination of where the Related Actions belong.  
19  
20

21 Given the rapidly evolving landscape of cases and the multiple disputes over their proper  
22 venue, Defendants respectfully request that the Court decline to enter a case schedule at this time,  
23 preserve the existing suspension of the deadline for Defendants to respond to the Complaint in  
24  
25  
26  
27

1 the above-captioned action, and direct Plaintiffs and Defendants to file a status report by January  
2 18, 2023 to apprise the Court of still unfolding events.<sup>6</sup>

26  
27 

---

<sup>6</sup> If the Court is inclined to enter a case schedule, Defendants disagree with Plaintiffs' proposed briefing schedule and page limits and respectfully request that the Court direct the parties to meet and confer regarding those matters.

/s/ Steve W. Berman

Steve W. Berman (WSBA No. 12536)  
steve@hbsslaw.com  
Breanna Van Engelen (WSBA No. 49213)  
breannav@hbsslaw.com  
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
1301 Second Ave., Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98101  
Telephone: (206) 623-7292

Rio S. Pierce (*pro hac vice*)  
riop@hbsslaw.com  
Hannah K. Song (*pro hac vice*)  
hannahso@hbsslaw.com  
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
715 Hearst Ave., Suite 300  
Berkeley, CA 94710  
Telephone: (510) 725-3000

*Counsel for Plaintiff Gabriel Navarro,  
Individually and on Behalf of All Others  
Similarly Situated*

/s/ Emily Brubaker Harris

Emily Brubaker Harris (WSBA No. 35763)  
eharris@correronin.com  
CORR CRONIN, LLP  
1015 Second Avenue, Floor 10  
Seattle, WA 98104-1001  
Telephone: (206) 625-8600

Stephen McIntyre (*pro hac vice*)  
smcintyre@omm.com  
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
400 South Hope Street, 18th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: (213) 430-8382

Ian Simmons (*pro hac vice*)  
isimmons@omm.com  
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
1625 Eye Street, NW  
Washington, DC 29996  
Telephone: (202) 383-5106

*Counsel for Defendant BH Management  
Services, LLC*

/s/ Heidi Bradley

Heidi Bradley (WSBA No. 35759)  
hbradley@bradleybernsteinllp.com  
BRADLEY BERNSTEIN SANDS LLP  
113 Cherry Street, PMB 62056  
Seattle, WA 98104-2205  
Telephone: (206) 337-6551

Darin Sands (WSBA No. 35865)  
dsands@bradleybernsteinllp.com  
BRADLEY BERNSTEIN SANDS LLP  
1425 SW 20th Ave., Suite 201  
Portland, OR 97201  
Telephone: (503) 734-2480

/s/ Stephen Weissman

Stephen Weissman (*pro hac vice*)  
sweissman@gibsondunn.com  
Michael J. Perry (*pro hac vice*)  
mjerry@gibsondunn.com  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: (202) 955-8678

Daniel G. Swanson (*pro hac vice*)  
dswanson@gibsondunn.com  
Jay Srinivasan (*pro hac vice*)  
jsrinivasan@gibsondunn.com  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
333 South Grand Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: (213) 229-7430

Ben A. Sherwood (*pro hac vice*)  
bsherwood@gibsondunn.com  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
200 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10166  
Telephone: (212) 351-2671

*Counsel for Defendant RealPage, Inc.*

/s/ Christopher W. Nicoll

Christopher W. Nicoll (WSBA No. 20771)  
cnicoll@nicollblack.com  
Melinda R. Drogseth (WSBA No. 40711)



/s/ Allison K. Krashan

Allison K. Krashan (WSBA No. 36977)  
akrashan@schwabe.com  
Cynthia Sue-Jin Park (WSBA No. 58012)  
cpark@schwabe.com

SCHWABE WILLIAMSON & WYATT  
1420 5th Ave Ste 3400  
Seattle, WA 98101-2339  
Telephone: (206) 622-1711

Timothy R. Beyer (*pro hac vice*)  
tim.beyer@bclplaw.com  
BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP  
1700 Lincoln Street, Suite 4100  
Denver, CO 80203  
Telephone: (303) 866-0481

Sarah Hartley (*pro hac vice*)  
sarah.hartley@bclplaw.com  
BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP  
1155 F Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: (303) 866-0363

*Counsel for Defendant Cardinal Group Holdings LLC*

/s/ William L. Monts, III

William L. Monts, III (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
william.monts@hoganlovells.com  
Benjamin F. Holt (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
benjamin.holt@hoganlovells.com  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: (202) 637-6440

Michael M. Maddigan (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
michael.maddigan@hoganlovells.com  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Telephone: (310) 785-4727

mdrogseth@nicollblack.com  
NICOLL BLACK & FEIG  
1325 Fourth Avenue Suite 1650  
Seattle, WA 98101  
Telephone: (206) 838-7515

Marisa Secco Giles (*pro hac vice*)  
mgiles@velaw.com  
VINSON & ELKINS LLP  
200 West 6th Street, Suite 2500  
Austin, Texas 78701  
Telephone: (512) 542-8781

Jason M. Powers (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
jpowers@velaw.com  
VINSON & ELKINS LLP  
845 Texas Avenue, Suite 4700  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Telephone: (713) 758-2522

*Counsel for Defendant Campus Advantage, Inc.*

/s/ Jeremy J. Calsyn

Jeremy J. Calsyn (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
jcalsyn@cgsh.com  
Leah Brannon (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
lbrannon@cgsh.com  
Kenneth Reinker (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
kreinker@cgsh.com  
CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN & HAMILTON LLP  
2112 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20037  
Telephone: (202) 974-1522

Joseph M. Kay (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
jkay@cgsh.com  
CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN & HAMILTON LLP  
One Liberty Plaza  
New York, NY 10006  
Telephone: (212) 225-2745

*Counsel for Defendants Cushman & Wakefield, Inc. and Pinnacle Property Management Services, LLC*

1 *Counsel for Defendant Greystar Real Estate*  
2 *Partners, LLC*

3 /s/ Michael F. Murray

4 Michael F. Murray (*pro hac vice*)  
5 michaelmurray@paulhastings.com  
6 Noah Pinegar (*pro hac vice*)  
7 noahpinegar@paulhastings.com  
8 PAUL HASTINGS LLP  
9 2050 M Street, NW  
10 Washington, DC 20036  
11 Telephone: (202) 551-1730

12 J. Chad Mitchell (WSBA No. 39689)  
13 Chadm@summitlaw.com  
14 Christopher T. Wion (WSBA No. 33207)  
15 Chrisw@summitlaw.com  
16 SUMMIT LAW GROUP  
17 315 5th Ave S, Ste 1000  
18 Seattle, WA 98104  
19 Telephone: 206-676-7000

20 *Counsel for Defendant CA Ventures Global*  
21 *Services, LLC*

/s/ Amy B. Manning

Amy B. Manning (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
amanning@mcguirewoods.com  
Angelo M. Russo (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
arusso@mcguirewoods.com  
MCGUIRE WOODS LLP  
77 West Wacker Drive, Suite 4100  
Chicago, IL 60601  
Telephone: (312) 750-8904

*Counsel for Defendant DP Preiss Company,*  
*Inc.*

/s/ Fred B. Burnside

Fred B. Burnside (WSBA No. 32491)  
fredburnside@dwt.com  
MaryAnn T. Almeida (WSBA No. 49086)  
maryannalmeida@dwt.com  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
920 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3300  
Seattle, WA 98104  
Telephone: (206) 757-8016

Yonaton Rosenzweig (*pro hac vice*  
forthcoming)  
yonirosenzweig@dwt.com  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
865 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 2400  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

*Counsel for Defendants The Michaels*  
*Organization and Interstate Realty*  
*Management Co.*